

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE
CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
APRIL 5, 1999**

The work session began at 5:30 p.m. in the Public Safety Building Community Meeting Room.

Present: Mayor Tomei and Councilors Kappa, King, Lancaster, and Marshall.

Staff present: City Manager Bartlett; Assistant City Managers Bennett and Richards; Public Works Director Brink; City Attorney Coleman; and Consultant Peg Caliendo.

Information Sharing

1. Councilor King

- *Community Links* publication on community solutions and neighborhoods involvement;
- She has been encouraging citizens to leave questions and concerns on Council voice mail, so she reminded others to check their voice mail regularly;
- Johnson Creek Watershed Committee meeting next week; and
- Festival Daze talent show.

2. Councilor Kappa

- He asked if there was anything Council wanted addressed on the upcoming Regional Water Purveyors meeting agenda. He agreed to provide the rest of the Council with a one-page synopsis of the group's activities.
- Recommended that Metropolitan Policy Advisory Committee's (MPAC) improve community involvement and form better partnerships with cities to by establishing a subcommittee made up of local planning commission members.

3. Councilor Marshall

- Attended the Riverfront Board meeting with Crandall in which the groundwork was laid and recent history of the previous committee was discussed. The Board is a very dynamic group, and the Council needs to be conscious of not holding it back. He generally had a positive feeling about the meeting.
- The North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District (NCPRD) is beginning its budget meetings. The District is behind in what it would like to have, and there is a move to increase user fees to make up for some of the budgetary gaps.

4. **Councilor Lancaster**

- He asked if the Milwaukie City Council was going to consider the resolution presented by Metro Councilor Atherton regarding repeal of ORS 197.296. He understood the resolution supported moving the issue from committee to the floor. He understood the issue was mandating that land be set aside without discussing how infrastructure would be funded.

Bartlett had checked with the City of Lake Oswego and found the Council had neither formally considered the resolution nor had a presentation.

Councilor Kappa said Atherton's resolution had to do with the 20-year land supply for residential, not commercial or industrial land.

The group discussed getting more information from both sides including the Homebuilders' Association that was opposed the Atherton's proposal.

Bartlett indicated the amendment has to do with Metro's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and is more of an issue for outlying cities such as Happy Valley, Oregon City, and Lake Oswego.

Councilor Lancaster said the other big issue was pressure to densify with the artificially imposed boundary. The resolution Atherton asked Council to consider only supported bringing the bill back on the floor.

Bartlett said he would have pro and con information ready for the next work session.

- He asked what the determination had been on Richard Cayo's letter offering to loan his planes to start an aircraft museum. Council had recommended Cayo contact the Riverfront Board.
- Discussed information as a strategic asset.

5. The group discussed who would attend the League of Oregon Cities Legislative Conference on April 20, 1999.

6. The group agreed to hold the executive session initially scheduled for 6:00 p.m. on April 6, 1999, after this work session.

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) **Representative Karl Rohde**

Rohde, JPACT representative and Lake Oswego Councilor, outlined of his position on transportation issues. The purpose of his meeting with the Milwaukie City Council was to have a broad-ranging conversation about transportation and how it relates to the City.

His discussion points were:

- Commuter rail
- Boulevards
- Transit service
- Maintenance and modernization needs
- Annexation
- Funding
- Peak hour level of service
- Bicycle and pedestrian connections

Rohde indicated that commuter rail was gaining regional interest due to the failure of South/North light rail. The proposed service would begin in McMinnville and potentially continue through Milwaukie to Portland's Union Station.

Councilor Kappa said his wife uses light rail on a daily basis and advocates its use. He felt it was important to look not only at commuter rail, but also other modes of transportation and consider peak hour levels of service.

Rohde discussed European rail systems, safety issues, and temporal displacement of freight and commuter uses. It would be conceivable that commuter rail could carry light freight such as mail.

Councilor Marshall believed that the region needed to look at a multimodal package of transportation options that included road infrastructure and light and commuter rail instead of forcing voters to make a decision on one issue.

Rohde said road investments have to do with issues of modernization and maintenance. He felt a lot could be accomplished by improving safety and flow through intersections. In the area of peak hour levels, there is an opinion in the region that roads should not be designed to accommodate rush hours only to remain virtually empty the rest of the time.

Councilor Marshall commented that he saw traffic increases during all times of the day. The region needs light rail, but one mode should not be sold as the panacea.

Mayor Tomei felt strongly that land should not be paved to add more traffic lanes and further encourage the use of cars.

Councilor Lancaster said the issue is balancing the modes. People are led by their pocketbooks, and there are options that have not been pursued. One option might be for employers to stagger work hours to relieve peak hour volumes. He also wanted to see an end to the Tri-Met monopoly.

Councilor King felt particular attention paid to neighborhood impacts and livability before more concrete is poured. She suggested developing a disincentive for through traffic using neighborhood streets.

Mayor Tomei urged Rohde to press for a boulevard treatment on McLoughlin Boulevard.

Councilor Kappa felt Metro and JPACT needed to increase contact with neighborhoods and Community Planning Organizations (CPO) to find a commonality.

M. Bennett pointed out that two projects, McLoughlin Boulevard treatment and Johnson Creek Boulevard reconstruction between 36th and 45th Avenues, were on the 150% cut list. She felt reasonably solid with McLoughlin Boulevard remaining on the list. Staff had prepared a letter to JPACT for the Mayor's signature addressing the petition Hatlelid and Cayo recently submitted to the City of Milwaukie and Metro opposing the Johnson Creek Boulevard Project Phase 3 improvements. The Mayor's letter detailed the importance of these improvements.

Staff has been contacting those who signed the petition to answer questions and to determine if the signers were adequately informed. Staff believes the design is neighborhood friendly and protects livability by keeping the travel and bike lanes narrow and installing sidewalks on only one side of the street. The narrow lanes will serve as a traffic calming device, and the residents will benefit by having bike lanes and sidewalks.

Brink discussed the history of the project beginning with Phase 1 in 1996 and Phase 2 which is currently underway. Phase 3 is street improvements from 36th Avenue to the bridge which will complete the entire project that began about ten years ago.

In speaking with 22 of the 42 property owners signing the petition, staff noted one of the most frequently made comments was that the road should have been built in the gulch. **Brink** reminded property owners that this was the final phase of a project that was begun ten years ago.

Other residents did not see the need for bike lanes because no one uses Johnson Creek Boulevard now. New bike lanes would provide a safe connection to the Springwater Corridor. The few cyclists using the current bike lane does not necessarily indicate a lack of interest.

Councilor Marshall commented the bike lanes were likely needed for funding purposes.

M. Bennett agreed the project would be less attractive and fundable without the sidewalk and bike lanes, and **Bartlett** added JPACT would not recommend funding.

Brink said property owners were also concerned with noise and fence replacement, but these are code and engineering issues that can be addressed.

Brink indicated the property impacts on a map. Some property owners, mostly on the south side of the street, will be asked to sell up to 21 feet of their property. The road needs to be moved from the cliff on the north side because of stability issues. After the gulch area, a four-foot right-of-way will be purchased for sidewalks. The primary issues were the slope and taking advantage of the existing pavement. He pointed out to the property owners that the tires would still be the same distance away because of the bike lane and sidewalk.

Brink added that people were supportive of improved drainage, sidewalk, and bike lane. It was his understanding that property owners would be interested if they felt they would be fairly compensated. Residents also want to be sure their landscaping and fences are replaced. He discussed right-of-way purchase for future sidewalks.

The group discussed traffic signals, and **Brink** indicated the only signal would likely be at 32nd Avenue.

Other issues included parking and traffic management. The only parking alternatives people will have are the driveway or the nearest side street. Narrow streets and bike lanes are two types of passive calming devices that will likely slow traffic on Johnson Creek Blvd. Staff recommended building the street as designed and then determine if additional traffic calming devices are needed.

Councilor Kappa asked if anything could be done to facilitate people backing out of their driveways. **Brink** responded that the bike lane and sidewalk provided some measure of safety. He believed that, with the existing restraints, the project designers had made the best choices.

Councilor Marshall asked if people understood landscaping would be replaced by the project.

Bartlett said those with special landscaping will have it replaced in kind, and the property owners will have the opportunity to tell the project how much they believe it will cost.

Councilor Marshall related this to Councilor King's comments about livability and putting things back the same or better than they were found.

Bartlett discussed the earlier SE Corridor Study. The decision not to put the road in the gully was probably a good one based on current environmental concerns. He discussed taking over County roads that have been brought up to urban standards.

It was consensus to authorize the Mayor to sign the letter to John Kvistad, Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation Chair, supporting the Johnson Creek Boulevard Phase 3 Project.

Rohde discussed project funding priorities.

Councilor Marshall was in favor a major transportation funding package that would address multimodal needs. He did not feel annexation was a major issue at this time.

Bartlett added that the City worked with the County to develop a Transportation System Plan (TSP) that took Milwaukie's full service area into consideration.

Rohde was interested in a tax-based system that would take into account the number of miles driven.

Communications -- Introduction and Review

Caliendo facilitated the discussion, and the each Councilor expressed his/her opinion of the 1999 Draft Communication Agreement. The group began discussing the bulleted list and made some minor revisions. The first two items were recommended to be changed to read:

- I will respect other members of the team; and
- I will participate fully with the group discussions and decisions.

The group discussed agreement and the role of the person on the losing side of a Council vote. **Councilor Kappa** had a philosophical disagreement with fully accepting a group decision and felt it might affect his rights of free speech. He felt the group could work as a team despite disagreements and differences of opinion.

Mayor Tomei felt it was important to accept the collective decision-making process of the group. She did not expect a dissenting vote to undermine or otherwise criticize a decision.

Councilor King did not see a problem with participating in working within those group decisions.

Councilor Marshall suggested that Council may agree not to work as a team and consciously decide to operate that way. He personally did not feel he had the right to undermine the group decision and felt he should act as part of a team.

Councilor Kappa pointed out that previous Council decisions have made a profound difference on the community. He had worked politically on flaglots, for example, to change things.

Councilor Lancaster was concerned about giving up his free speech and felt that trust and honesty would keep things from going too far.

Coleman suggested that Councilors could agree among themselves to not actively oppose and to speak to a disagreement only if asked. Allow members to express themselves without actively opposing the group decision.

Councilor Kappa felt that was hypocritical.

Councilor Lancaster re-qualified his position. If Council operates with good open communication between its members and the community, then he could agree to not actively oppose a decision made by the majority. To publicly oppose a decision would only cause damage. He inferred there would be no active opposition.

Councilor Marshall interpreted the draft statement to mean that a decision would be accepted, that the individual would not try to circumvent the group's decision, and the individual as part of the group would move forward.

Councilor Kappa said taking part in the Council process should not take away from his freedom of speech.

The group discussed the difference between going to the community to gather information versus actively opposing a decision.

Council Rules

Bartlett suggested the Council review the Troutdale Municipal Code for possible revisions to Milwaukie's ordinance.

Riverfront Board

Councilor Marshall was disappointed in the turn out and felt a letter or postcard should have gone to each resident or a blanket invitation published. People told him they thought it was "just another riverfront meeting."

Councilor Kappa said some people did not believe it was sufficiently publicized.

Councilor King felt there should have been notice in the City newsletter, and **Bartlett** responded there was not enough time because the location was not known.

Councilor Marshall urged marketing the project early on. He suggested asking each Neighborhood District Association (NDA) to give up part of its monthly column so extra space could be given to riverfront project coverage. He recommended spending money on a marketing campaign.

Councilor Lancaster said it was also up to each Councilor to communicate with residents.

It was agreed the Council would hold a subsequent Teambuilding and Communication work session on April 15, 1999, at 5:30 p.m., location to be announced.

Bartlett announced a City Council executive session in the Public Safety Building Library pursuant to ORS 192.660 (1) (f) and (h) to consider records that are exempt by law from public inspection and to consult with legal counsel.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Pat DuVal, Recorder